Hist

THE PATRIOT

No. 13.—Vol. I. 4 MAY, 1922. PRICE SIXPENCE.
Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.

PLANNING THE WORLD REVOLUTION—See page 7.

CONTENTS.

	Page
We are Betrayed by What is False Within	1
Genoa and the International	2
Notes of the Week	3
The New Art of Propaganda	5
A Russian Protest	5
Bolshevism and the Universities	6
The Communist Congress	7
The German Bolshevik Conspiracy—VI.	8
The Conchy in the Civil Service	10
An Overheard Conversation	11
Letters of a Patriot—VI.	11
The Outlook in Ireland	12
The Ways of Trade Unions	14
Correspondence	14
A Glossary of Political and Labour Terms—No. 13	15

All communications for the Editor or Manager to be addressed to—The Boswell Printing and Publishing Co., Ltd., 2, Whitefriars Street, E.C.4.

LIBRARY

WE ARE BETRAYED BY WHAT IS FALSE WITHIN.

We have taken our readers upon a voyage through certain little-known broads and backwaters of English history in order to show them that the past is like the present, and the present is like the past. To understand our own times helps us to understand the times of our forefathers, and, contrariwise, to know our history gives us an insight into the present and even into the future.

What we have seen in our English history is a constant struggle against a foreign influence: in the Middle Ages it was the dominating influence of organised German commerce that threatened our independence. Simon de Montfort fought heroically for the principle of England for the English, and was slain by the help of the "King of Alemaigne" on the battlefield of Evesham. Warwick the King-Maker fought in the same cause, making war against German influence and German fleets, and opposing an alliance with France to an alliance with Germany, and he was slain at the Battle of Barnet by Edward IV., who had been brought back to his kingdom in a German fleet. "Justly," says the German historian Lappenberg, "was the Hanse delighted over the return of King Edward. It had furthered this return because it saw in this event the surest means to re-establish peace *and its privileges*." Odd, is it not, that at the present time we are being told by our trusted Prime Minister, or his Press, that peace and German privileges go together! "With a dynasty at Westminster depending on the House of Valois," says Pauli, another German historian, "neither the Hanse nor Flanders could have lived at peace, and the Hanseatic merchant in London could hardly have recovered his privileges." Odd, again, that we are now being told that our alliance with the successor of the House of Valois (the French Republic) must be abandoned in the interest of peace! Is it possibly also in the interest of the German merchant?

The common motive of these recurring betrayals is finance. A needy English Government gets into debt to the foreigner, and meets its obligations by bartering away the interests of its own subjects. But it is amusing to remember that the little god Cupid has—in former times—played his part in the German interest. It is an old story, but as it is not generally known we may tell it here.

The German privileges, of which we have given an account, were swept away in the reign of Edward VI., and it was the object of the Emperor Charles V. to recover them. The chance came with the match between Queen Mary and his son, King Philip.

The Emperor entrusted the marriage negotiations to his Ambassador in London, and instructed him that,

> "As the men of Cologne and the other towns are our subjects of the Empire. . . . he must assist the ambassadors those towns are sending to England to solicit for the re-establishment of the ancient privileges and liberties enjoyed of old in England by their inhabitants."

So the German Ambassador made the restoration of these privileges a condition of the match. Bishop Gardiner, Chancellor (*i.e.*, Prime Minister), objected at first.

> "He did not know," said Gardiner, "what the merchants of England would say to it, except that it was intended to enrich foreigners by opening the gates of the country to them and impoverish its unfortunate inhabitants."

"Opening the gates of the country to foreigners." Curious—is it not?—to see almost the very language of our modern economic controversies used between a German Ambassador and an English statesman in the middle of the sixteenth century!

The Ambassador was cunning. "I made

answer," he reports to his master, "that if the Queen approved of delay I would not be able to disagree." The answer was reported to the Queen, who did not approve of delay; but, on the contrary, sent for her Lord Chancellor and soundly rated him, so that he was fain to submit and restore the German privileges!

Queen Elizabeth came to the throne upon an opposite policy. She had been advised by the great London merchant, Sir Thomas Gresham, that the Free Trade privileges granted to the German merchant were the principal cause of the "undoing of this realm," and that it would be wiser, as well as more patriotic, to depend upon her own merchants for financial support. She followed out that policy, and became the most popular monarch in English history. True, she had to fight what was then the greatest power in Europe—the allied forces of Spain the Empire and the Papacy, who used every weapon against her: propaganda, bulls, interdicts, armadas; but as she remained faithful to England, England remained faithful to her, and as we were united from Commons to Crown, we won through:

> Naught shall make us rue,
> If England to itself do rest but true.

Then came the Stuarts with their return to the calamitous policy of dependence on a foreign power, not the Empire any longer, for that was sloping down to utter destruction in the Bolshevism of the Thirty Years' War, but Spain, Holland, and then France—any Power, in fact, but England.

Such is the eternal struggle between Nationalism and Internationalism in English history, and it is going on at this hour. We see our Prime Minister, who was returned to power on a patriotic and national policy, and who swore he would support English interests against Germany—we see him now submitting to an alliance between Germany and Russia, which threatens our very existence, and scolding our Ally France (through his Press) because she refuses to join him in this treason to the Allied cause.

In the old days the motive of betrayal of the national interest was generally finance. A needy monarch desired to fill his purse, and offered in exchange for a loan the interests of his own subjects. We do not know what the motive of Mr. Lloyd George may be. It is said that he hopes to win Labour support by pandering to the Bolsheviks. But if the secret accounts of the party funds were revealed it is possible that we might find a more substantial reason. Certain it is that the motive power behind the German-Bolshevik alliance is not the Soviet, which is the servant; but the German-Jewish capitalist, who is the master of this terrible combination, and who is, no doubt, seeking, as in the Wars of the Roses, to restore the privileges of the German merchant in London.

GENOA AND THE INTERNATIONAL.

GERMAN INFLUENCE.

BY A SOCIALIST.

In a telegram from Genoa, published by the *Times* of 21 April, Mr. Wickham Steed says that the unity of the Allied front has been restored. On the other hand, Signor Facta proclaimed that "at the Conference there were neither allies, enemies, nor neutrals, but only men." In reality, so far, the Conference has been a "burning satire" upon those who thought it meant "a new epoch of undifferentiated European brotherhood."

The Socialist and Labour parties are faced by exactly the same failure. What is the so-called International but an association where, in Signor Facta's words, there shall be "neither allies, enemies, nor neutrals," but only Internationalists? Is it likely that International Congresses or Conferences, where many of the delegates have received no special diplomatic training, should manage better than the statesmen, the diplomatists and technicians now assembled at Genoa? As a fact, "undifferentiated European brotherhood" has not been better established within the International than at the Genoa Conference, where, we are assured, the "Allies' front has now been restored."

If it were correct, this news would be welcome, as we must reckon with the threatening fact that German leadership has been restored in all the Socialist Internationals. These Internationals do not represent European brotherhood, but are the result of successful German intrigue. Thus at the Congress held at Geneva in August, 1920, the Second International was formally reconstructed, and London selected as its headquarters. Thereupon the Socialist member of the Dutch Parliament, Dr. Troelstra said:—"The future now depends on Moscow or London. So far, what has Moscow done—a great deal. What has London done—nothing at all!" Throughout the Congress German influence predominated, and the British delegates were more pro-German than the Germans themselves. The Moscow International being Bolshevist, is absolutely in the hands of the Germans. This, again, is affirmed by the *Times*. Its leader of 22 April says:—

"'Russia for the Bolshevists, and the Bolshevists for us,' has been the basis of German policy since a German Government sent Lenin over the frontier." So, whether the International of London or of Moscow predominates, it will always mean German supremacy.

As for the Two-and-a-Half or Vienna International and the Two-and-Three-quarters International now forming, it is only necessary to record the past of the persons concerned or read their speeches and resolutions to realise the pro-German feelings that must prevail within their ranks. In spite, however, of these three so-called Internationals, there is not at present any real International in existence. We may have one or more pan-German Internationals; but what could not be maintained before the war is less likely to be achieved after the war. The Second International was founded in 1882 as a real International, but in 1893, at the Zurich Congress, it became a pan-German International. That is why the Germans have lost no opportunity to promote its revival. This also explains why, if to-day we have no real International, we have at least three pan-German Internationals. The Germans have known how to profit by the undoubted craving for some sort of International that prevails throughout the Labour world. If, therefore, we must have an incomplete International rather than none at all, why should not an anti-German International be also established. At present every aspiration towards Internationalism perforce drifts into German hands. But this is a result for which the Germans have schemed and worked during more than half a century. Other nations have not done anything of the sort. Is it not time that the Allies bestirred themselves?

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

A Bubble Reputation.

The *National Review* is always good. But lately it has surpassed itself. The two articles, "The Man Who Didn't Win the War" and "The Man Who Lost the Peace," the one in the March and the other in the April number, prick the bubble reputation of the Prime Minister with the keen point of truth. Mr. Lloyd George did not win the war: it was won, in fact, by the soldiers and the sailors of the Allied Powers, to whom such a phrase is an insult. On the contrary, Mr. Lloyd George very nearly lost the war before it was even fought. For he was one of that pro-German and Little-Navy Party which was always working to break with France and reduce the naval estimates. When war was in the balance, he took the side of the *Daily News;* he introduced a deputation of bankers, largely Jewish, to the Prime Minister to prove to him that war would be bad for trade; and in the Cabinet—so the story goes—he produced a map of Europe to prove to his colleagues that Belgium was, after all, a very small country—not worth fighting about!

Not War, But a Place.

His first activity in the war was not to drive the Germans out of France; but to drive his own chief out of office—and to take his place. It was a good thing to get Mr. Asquith out; but the man who did it should not have been a colleague. Treachery to a friend is not a quality which should endear a man to decent people. It is certainly not an English virtue, and one can hardly suppose it to be a Welsh. And did Mr. Lloyd George when he succeeded Mr. Asquith really do any better? No; upon the contrary, he did rather worse. Mr. Asquith, whatever his faults, never interfered with the soldier. Mr. Lloyd George imagined himself to be a tactician and a strategist, and was always interfering with military operations. Moreover—what is not quite so well known—was always trying to open some little back-door of negotiation with the enemy. When peace came and he was pretending to be robustly anti-German, he was, as we now know from the *Westminster Gazette* incident, secretly flirting with the pro-German and anti-French party (his old love). No, the Prime Minister certainly did not win the war. But, in compensation, he is losing the peace.

The New Frankenstein.

The Duke of Northumberland in the April number of the *National Review* draws attention to the very formidable power the Prime Minister is conjuring into existence:—

> According to a decree of the "People's Commissaries" of December 22, 1921, the Red Army is to be raised to the number of 2,500,000 men, with an additional 5,000,000 in the training battalions, preparing for military service from the age of fifteen years. The armament is to some extent British, but mainly German, and Krupp has taken charge of the munition factories of Putiloff and Okhta, as well as the rifle factories, and considerable progress is being made with the latter. The purpose for which this army exists was disclosed by one of the Bolshevik leaders to M. Jeuneret, a Swiss professor, and his words were quoted in the *Daily Chronicle* of 4 February, 1919: "Nothing will be easier for us than to raise five million men to invade and crush Western Europe. Our alliance with the Germans will give the means of immediate revenge."

It is this alliance which the Prime Minister is now permitting.

The Attack on France.

France, which remains true to the cause of the Allies, opposes this alliance, which is, in fact, in contravention of the Treaty of Versailles. The Prime Minister, who pretended to be shocked at the alliance, refuses to join France in prohibiting it, so that France is placed in this horrid dilemma: If she opposes the alliance, she breaks with the British Prime Minister; if she acquiesces in the alliance, she allows the creation of a new power in Europe strong enough to destroy herself and enslave Europe. We sincerely hope M. Poincaré will nail his colours to the mast; if he does, he will find that the Entente is still strong in England—stronger possibly than the Prime Miniser supposes—and that it has also powerful friends in the United States—which are also threatened.

Genoa and Bolshevism.

The comments of Bolshevist papers on the Genoa Conference are far more instructive than the illusory articles of the Downing Street organs. In the official journal of the Communist International it is frankly admitted that the negotiations at Genoa, whatever the result may be, will increase the prestige of the Bolshevists and will be a further step towards the destruction of the bourgeoisie of Western Europe. Some of the comrades in the Communist Party of Great Britain are a little nervous lest the recognition of the Soviet Government by the Western Powers might interfere with the relations between the Soviet and the Third International. Miss Ellen Wilkinson, of Manchester, who has recently been in Moscow, and who is one of the leaders here of the Red International of Labour Unions, recently expressed this fear in the *Communist*. But other comrades hasten to assure her that such fears are quite groundless. Whatever happens at Genoa, the Communist International will carry on, and its relations with the Soviet Government will be unimpaired.

A Bolshevik Gesture.

The most explicit statement on this point is made by Mrs. Dora B. Montefiore, of Crowborough, Sussex. This lady is one of the leaders of the Communist Party, and during the war she took part in the Leeds Convention, called by Pacifists and revolutionaries, to form Workers' and Soldiers' Councils. Her frequent contributions to the *Communist* show that she is an ardent supporter of the Soviet tyranny. Writing in that paper, of April 29, on "The Implications of Genoa," she says:—

> Surely Comrade Ellen Wilkinson does not seriously believe that Russia, by sending delegates to Genoa, "has taken any kind of place in the Capitalist comity of nations," and will therefore "cease to voice and work for the Communist ideal"? On the contrary, Soviet Russia will now have for the first time the opportunity to speak of her ideal to the whole world, and those of us who know the record and have measured the intelligence of Russia's Commissars, and of Russia's delegates to Genoa, realise that they understand to the full the wisdom of the gesture *reculer pour mieux sauter.*

"A Staggering Blow."

"Comrade Ellen Wilkinson" had also said that "there is no immediate likelihood of the World Revolution happening." But Mrs. Montefiore assures Comrade Wilkinson that the prospects for the World Revolution are fairly good.

> Reaction and Individualism undoubtedly reign supreme in our small island, writes Comrade Dora Montefiore; but

the mighty and mysterious East on the further frontier of Russia responds to the Communist ideal in a way which the exploited slaves of Western "civilisation" cannot realise. The black and coloured men of South Africa, torn by modern capitalism from their primitive communism in order to make profits for white men, understand when the propaganda of solidarity in face of oppression from wage slavery is preached to them, and are ready to rise whenever the white workers shall have learnt *their* lesson of solidarity. . . . Ireland, Egypt, and India, they are all ready when the hour strikes. What does it matter making some economic adjustments, or granting a few trading concessions at Genoa or elsewhere, if at the moment that gesture is made British Imperialism can receive a staggering blow? World revolutions are not made from one day to another, but I believe firmly that the astuteness of the Russian delegates at Genoa will set up one of the sign-posts that mark the way along which world revolution is travelling.

Terrorism in Coventry.

The terroristic methods of the Coventry Communists, described in THE PATRIOT last week, still continue. The *Daily Herald* of 25 April publishes a report from its Coventry Correspondent, in which it is stated that "effective steps" have been taken by the A.E.U. "to prevent overtime being worked at non-federation shops." The correspondent adds :

In the case of the Swift works, the A.E.U. officials, having heard of the management's intention to keep men on all night, secured a promise that operations should cease at 11 p.m. In the meantime, however, Jack Leckie, Communist Parliamentary candidate for Coventry, with a number of the local unemployed organisation, entered the works *and forced a cessation of work, which had been already agreed to.* The A.E.U. officials waited quietly outside to see that the compact to stop at eleven was carried out.

The Soviet in Ireland.

The Bolsheviks in Ireland are cunningly concealing their activities, and even pose as the apostles of peace. But the truth is that Irish Labour is completely under the domination of a revolutionary body, the Transport Union, which is in touch with the Third International, and designs to create a Workers' Republic in Ireland. The *Evening Standard* of 25 April had the following very interesting information on the recent one-day strike :—

Yesterday I ran across a well-known man who had just come from Ireland. He was surprised that the English people accepted that the one-day's compulsory stoppage of work as a protest against militarism was a move towards peace. The hold-up of all labour was a deliberate manifestation of power by the Bolshevist Transport Workers' Union, a demonstration that the military, Free State, or Republic must not interfere with Soviet authority.

When we had the big railway strike in England, the Government improvised machinery so that the needs of the population should be served. Nobody in Dublin dared take any action against the decree of the Transport Workers' Union. My friend urged me to make clear to the British public, which I am now doing, that the strike was hated by the Collins and De Valera people, that it really had nothing directly to do with the international Anglo-Irish situation, but was intended as proof that the Bolshevists could rule both parties. No work of any sort was allowed yesterday in the South and West of Ireland ; no trains, nor tramcars, nor cabs, no shops were open, no telegraphing or telephoning, no sport, no banks, no clerks working, and not a servant in any hotel allowed to do anything after breakfast. I was assured by my informant—a very important man at Westminster—that this exercise of Soviet power was the most significant and remarkable thing he had ever witnessed.

The Jewish Press.

We notice that the *Jewish Guardian* has been attacking THE PATRIOT, and even hints that we may find ourselves upon what Sir Toby Belch called "the windy side of the law" for our alleged "anti-Semitism." The same paper, by the way, recently attacked the *Morning Post* in words which looked so very much like a threat that it was promptly asked to explain itself, and did rather abjectly explain that it only used the words complained of in a "popular" sense. If we might venture to put it to our Jewish friends, these thinly veiled menaces are not the best way of succeeding with Englishmen, and tend rather to increase than abate what is called anti-Semitism. If the Jewish Press, instead of hinting at prison and boycott, would show themselves whole-hearted in fighting Bolshevism even when it rears its ugly head among their own people, it would be doing them better service. We had always supposed that the *Jewish Guardian* was started to fight just those tendencies in the Jewish Press of which we have had to complain. It was started just about the time that ten leading Jews joined to write a letter of protest against the Bolshevik tendencies of the *Jewish Chronicle*. But these ten unfortunate Jews were so pilloried and threatened as "mosserim" (a horrible word meaning spies or informers) that they have been silent on the subject ever since, and the *Jewish Guardian*, if its original intention was to fight Bolshevism among the Jews, has done nothing ever since but attack any Gentile paper which dares to refer to the subject.

Jewish Timidity.

The fact is that the *Jewish Guardian* dares not to oppose openly what it knows to be going on. It is terrified into silence by the menaces of its Jewish contemporaries. We suppose it to represent a group which is well aware of the mischief done to British Jewry both by the Communist movement and the Nationalist movement, which are seducing the Jews, the one into subversion, the other into dual allegiance. As to Bolshevism, a correspondent makes a suggestion, which we present to our contemporary :—

For those who still doubt the connection between Bolshevism and Jewry, I would recommend a half-hour or so on the pavement outside Soviet House, in Moorgate Street, and a scrutiny of the types who go in and out of that hive of propaganda.

We might add the advice that our contemporary send a representative to any Communist demonstration and judge for itself whether or no Jews are not active in the campaign of subversion. Why is it? Have the Jews anything to complain of in their treatment by England in recent times, or do they go back—like one of our correspondents—to the days of a King Edward or a King John for the broken threads of an ancient feud? At any rate, we can assure the *Jewish Guardian* that THE PATRIOT will continue to do what it considers its duty by the British public, undeterred by hints, however delicately conveyed, of terrible things in store for it.

St. Pancras for England!

On March 23 we gave an account of the seditious and treasonable utterances of Communists in the St. Pancras Town Hall. We are glad to see that a woman councillor, Miss B. Kent, has had the courage and patriotism to put the following motion :—

Whereas, at the conference held by the Communist Party in the Council Chamber on March 18 and 19, high treason and sedition were uttered against the State, and whereas by letting of the Chamber for such a purpose the Council violated one of its own conditions. The Council hereby resolves that it shall not be let again for a similar purpose, in the best interests of the people of the borough.

The motion was referred to the Parliamentary Committee, possibly with the purpose of shelving it. But we hope the patriotic citizens of St. Pancras will support Miss Kent and will not let the matter drop.

THE NEW ART OF PROPAGANDA.

BY LORD SYDENHAM.

The two most marked characteristics of the present time are the difficulty of ascertaining the unadulterated truth and the distracted state of public opinion divided into discordant sections. The conditions of mental bewilderment promised to the Gentiles in the "Protocols" are being fulfilled before our eyes. While the fundamental distinction between right and wrong is in danger of being lost, polemics—domestic and international—flourish exceedingly, and add to the general confusion of counsels. The immense development of means of transmitting and disseminating the views of comparatively few individuals, and the intense complexity of affairs, which hard-worked men and women can no longer follow with any hope of full understanding, combine to reduce the formation of sound opinion to a psychological gamble. How far propaganda aggravates these evils cannot accurately be judged, but it is at least certain that the propagandist never enjoyed opportunities comparable to those of the present day.

Improving on the methods of Bismarck, the Germans have reduced propaganda to a fine art, which the Bolsheviks, with their assistance, have adopted with world-wide success. A volume could be written upon the nature and effects of propaganda before and during the Great War, and a comparison between the results achieved by military action and by the artificial manipulation of opinion would surprise most people. In his important book, "La mystification des peuples alliés," recently published, M. Chéradame has given an interesting study of propagandist action, rightly describing it as "a process of suggestion which, during a certain time, enables millions of men to be made to believe the most false ideas." If—so the Germans have discovered—you can popularise certain words, phrases, and formulas, auto-suggestion will do the rest. Thus during the War, it was sought to spread broadcast such "magic" expressions as "humanity," "nationality," "the right of self-determination," "militarism must be destroyed," "down with Imperialism," "the control of democracy must be organised." Here are the starting points of trains of ideas which, working upon minds that do not attach precise meanings to them, will produce the effects desired by the propagandist.

In 1919-1920, as M. Chéradame points out, the Allied peoples were instructed that Germany could not pay for the damage she had inflicted, and that, in the sacred interests of peace, no more should be demanded than she could afford on her own showing. The effect was excellent and Mr. Keynes has earned the lasting gratitude of international financiers.

In 1920-1921, a further step could be taken. The "general idea," in military parlance, was that the restoration of Europe must be dealt with as a whole without any too rigid discrimination between victors and vanquished. This has worked like a spell. In the middle of 1921, the Jew Parvus (Helphand), the inventor of applied Bolshevism and the confederate of Lenin, started the suggestion of the need of a Franco-German commercial entente, the object being, according to M. Chéradame, to form composite syndicates, the French members of which would be able to influence their Government to ease its claims on Germany. The visit of the Pan-German Stinnes and the Jew capitalist Rathenau to this country had the same aim, and was not unfruitful. At this time also the key idea, that Germany alone was not responsible for the war, was diligently circulated. This idea, states M. Chéradame, was launched after the agreement arrived at in London in May with a view to further reduction of the indemnity. Concurrently, France was proclaimed to be "militarist and Imperialist," and therefore the only obstacle to the general peace. This manœuvre was successful in causing France to be suspected "even in the United States." The corollary that "Germany having disarmed, all the other Powers ought to disarm," was widely circulated in the hope of rendering France impotent, while Germany could retain the elements necessary for the rapid creation of a large army. Finally and very astutely, it was urged that, "in order to reach peace in the shortest time Germany ought to be admitted to the League of Nations." This was desired because the League, largely the work of the Judaic supporters of Germany, could be manipulated in German interests.

While the German propagandists were thus busily employed, Lenin, disposing of a wealth of stolen property, could be trusted to inspire Communism in other countries, and especially in Great Britain, with a view to paralysing British industry and to destroy British prestige to the advantage of Germany. Radek (Sobelsohn), also a Jew, and one of Lenin's accomplices, has distinguished himself in this direction, with results of which we are painfully aware.

The theories of M. Coué have a wider application than the domain of healing. If one repeats "self-determination" with sufficient frequency, one may come to believe that the Moplahs have a divine right to democratic institutions. Anyone who has tried to study recent happenings—political and economic—must have come across numerous indications of alien suggestion, and in the methods lucidly explained by M. Chéradame there lie grave dangers to all democracies, but especially to the British Empire.

A RUSSIAN PROTEST.

The following protest is taken from the French paper *Le Dimanche*, which is the organ of the Russian exiles :—

"In the proceedings of the Conference at Genoa, and in all the minutes of those proceedings, the Bolsheviks are falsely described as '*Representatives of Russia.*' It is quite inadmissible that these murderers should be considered as representatives of their tortured and martyred victims; therefore, in the name of numbers of Russian patriots, we raise an energetic protest against the application to the '*Agents of the Soviets*' of a name so honourable as that of representatives of Russia; and we affirm our unalterable conviction that the legal government which the restored Russian people will establish themselves in full freedom will never recognise any agreement made by the temporary oppressors of their country.

"We are entitled to hope that the Press of the countries truly friendly to Russia will feel it a duty to make known this protest and give it every consideration."

BOLSHEVISM AND THE UNIVERSITIES.

THE ORGANISATION OF SEDITION.

We had a sudden awakening a few months ago to the open propagation of Communism and revolution in the Universities of Great Britain in the notorious affair of the *Free Oxford*, a periodical edited and produced by Oxford undergraduates, which deliberately and shamelessly advocated the bestial absurdities of International Communism. The prompt and drastic action which was taken by Dr. Farnell to deal with this peril may perhaps have lulled the law-abiding public in a sense of false security. No greater mistake can be made than to underestimate the pertinacity and the cunning of the International Bolshevik and of his British "comrades," or to think that they can be reduced to impotence by one rebuff. The attempts of Lenin and the murderers of Moscow (if Mr. Lloyd George will permit me to call them this) to plant atheism and sedition in our English Universities have not by any means been abandoned.

Last week at Caister-on-Sea, near Great Yarmouth, there was held a conference of a body called the University Socialist Federation. This organisation was founded in 1913 by Mr. Clifford Allen, that sterling patriot (pacifist and conscientious objector and now a Labour candidate for Parliament), and it is now in a flourishing state. Its principal strongholds are the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge; but it has a membership in London University, and there are affiliated groups in Manchester, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Birmingham, Leeds, Cardiff, and Aberystwyth; it publishes a periodical entitled the *University Socialist Federation Bulletin*. The secretary and most of the leading spirits are avowed Communists acting under the instructions of the Third International. And it is deliberately and openly working to propagate among the sons of the educated class of Great Britain those very principles that have reduced that class to ruin and poverty in Russia!

It is surely something that cannot be ignored that the U.S.F. provides an easy channel for the direction of the natural enthusiasm of idealistic youth into that network of seditious and subversive organisations misleadingly called the "Labour" movement. The vast accession to the forces of disruption and anarchy, inevitable apparently after the world upheaval, is menacing enough in all conscience, but it is trebly serious when the international unrest of the working-man, exploited as it is by professional demagogues, should be reinforced by the zealous, though misdirected, energies of the educated sons of our own bourgeoisie. Revolutions usually draw their leaders from the middle class, but that class invariably suffers most.

The most dangerous people in the British "Labour" movement to-day are not the ranting half-baked demagogues and wirepullers in the executive positions of the Trade Unions. The real menace comes from the educated intellectuals, who seldom appear in the limelight, preferring to work in the background.

The University Socialist Federation is nothing less than a body which exists for the sole purpose of training and development of this latter type of individual. Surely no patriotic loyalist can afford to regard this as of little significance?

One of the most important contributions made by University Socialism to the revolutionary movement is the Labour Research Department. The L.R.D., to which many trade unions and co-operative societies are affiliated, is staffed and controlled almost entirely by University Socialists and members of the U.S.F.; it is a very important organisation which gets far too little notice. The L.R.D. has been the reserve of brains behind practically every industrial dispute since the Armistice. It was responsible for preparing the evidence brought by the miners before the Coal Commission; it performed the same task for the Dockers' Union before Lord Shaw's inquiry; and, as we learnt from the report published in THE PATRIOT a few weeks ago, it handled the publicity for the N.U.R. during the railway strike. (Judging from the standard of excellence attained by Mr. J. H. Thomas in his more recent outpourings, the L.R.D. has put one of its fingers in that pie, too.) At present it is co-operating with the A.E.U. in the latter's attempt to prevent the restoration of normal economic conditions to the engineering industries.

Thus we see that the L.R.D. cannot by any means be ignored; and it is to be hoped that those people who prefer to ignore Communism in the Universities will bear in mind that practically all the leading personalities of the L.R.D. are members of the University Socialist Federation.

A list of all the University Socialists who have attained high rank in the hierarchy over which Mr. Henderson pontificates would be a very long one indeed. But we may mention some of them: The Labour Research Department has for its secretaries two members of the University Socialist Federation, Mr. G. D. H. Cole and Mr. R. Page Arnot. One of the executive officers of the L.R.D. is Mr. A. L. Bacharach, a former chairman of the University Socialist Federation.

Members of the University Socialist Federation are very active also in the Communist Party. Miss Ellen Wilkinson, of the U.S.F. Executive, is a member of the British Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions. The chairman of the special commission recently set up by the Communist Party to report on organisation (as mentioned in a recent number of THE PATRIOT) is Mr. R. Palme Dutt, a prominent member of the U.S.F., who is the editor of that highbrow revolutionary periodical the *Labour Monthly*. Two of the most assiduous contributors to the *Communist* and the *Communist Review* are both University Socialists, Mr. R. W. Postgate and Mr. J. T. Walton Newbold. The Associate editor of the *Daily Herald* is also a University Socialist, Mr. Gerald Gould. Finally, to cut short an incomplete list, there is Mr. Maurice H. Dobb, who, though still a Cambridge undergraduate, is a weighty and learned contributor to the *Communist Review* and the *Plebs*. This does not, of course, exhaust the long roll of University Socialists prominent in the "Labour" movement. Some of them, such as Mr. R. H. Tawney, late of the Coal Commission, are Labour Party candidates for Parliament. But I think, without prolonging my list, that I have given sufficient facts to prove that the University Socialist Federation is a body that will bear very close observation.

One word more, and it is this: The Universities are to-day appealing to the nation for financial assistance. Are they in return prepared to give guarantees that they will not permit the unchecked propaganda of Communism and of Revolution among those who will benefit by the money?

L. C.

THE COMMUNIST CONGRESS.

PLANNING THE WORLD REVOLUTION.

By W. FAULKNER.

The Communist Party of Great Britain has just published the official report (price 2s. 6d.) of the Third Congress of the Communist International, held at Moscow from 22 June to 12 July, 1921. It is most valuable for reference. To put it mildly, all the objections of France to dealings with Bolshevism are fully justified by this report. The Congress was attended by delegates from all parts of the world, and the Jewish organisations—the "Polish Bund" and "Poale Zion"—were represented. Lord Birkenhead is reported to have remarked at Genoa the other day that the Bolshevist leaders were not fools If the Lord Chancellor can spare the time to read this report of the Moscow Congress he will discover that the Bolshevist leaders are not fools but knaves.

The Attack on France.

During the opening proceedings of the Congress the French Communists were attacked because they had failed to carry out all the instructions of Moscow. That scoundrel Bela Kun (Cohen) stated that he had approached one of the French comrades during the March rising in Germany, and had suggested that the French Communists should organise propaganda in the French Army "if the Rhine provinces were to be occupied." The French comrade took fright at this suggestion, and told Bela Kun that it "would be high treason." Comrade Thalheimer, of Germany, also complained to the Congress that the French Communists had not, in Parliament and the Press, supported the Germans on the question of reparations. A French Communist, Vaillant Couturier, replying to these criticisms, said that the party in France had not yet been properly constituted, "but we have already taken on ourselves the initiative of creating important secret organisations for the arming of the proletariat." Trotsky said that the French party "has sinned considerably," and "has allowed possibilities for action to slip by." He added that "we will not demand that the French party promises a revolution or a rebellion when the eighteen class is called up (for the army). The Congress, however, must demand of the French party that it prepares for the revolution, and that it has a clear conception of proletarian revolution."

A similar debate on Communist activities in Czecho-Slovakia shows that preparations are being made for a revolution there, and that the secret arming of the proletariat is going on, as in France. These facts make Mr. Lloyd George's disarmament talk ridiculous. The French Government understands that peace is not possible while the Bolshevists and their German allies have any power in Europe. As Comrade Braun, of the Polish Communist Party, told the Congress, "The Communist International will conduct the struggle not by means of statistics and figures, but with the sword."

There is much talk at Genoa about the economic reconstruction of Europe, and Mr. Lloyd George appeals to America to come to his aid. But his Bolshevist friends don't want this reconstruction. One of the Indian delegates to Moscow, Comrade Roy, said that there was a danger of England and America forming an alliance to restore the economic equilibrium, and he added, "We must devote all our energies to prevent the possibility of such an alliance to re-establish the economic equilibrium." The Soviet lives by creating strife, and peace is fatal to its schemes. A delegate named Kara-Sadiel reported on the progress of Bolshevist propaganda in the East, and stated that—

> The Near East is now the key to India and to China, and it is characteristic that here every activity which may result in revolutionary action bears at first a national character. Revolutionary work here must start by freeing the labouring masses of their religious prejudices—only then can purely Communist education begin. The workers of England must get into touch with those of India, and if then the German and French workers follow, the English will cease to feel secure against revolution in India.

Boring from Within.

Radek, discussing the special difficulties of propaganda in the various countries, said :—

> Take, for example, the question of our attitude to the English Labour Party. Some of the English comrades were absolutely opposed to the idea of working within this party owing to its opportunism. We, however, insisted on the necessity of "boring from within" on the ground that in a country like England it was imperative that we utilise the opportunities offered by very large labour organisations to penetrate its ranks, develop within it energetic work with the object of winning over the workers to our camp.

Mr. Tom Mann stated that the British Bolshevists were endeavouring "to unite with the groups in India who were striving to liberate the nations enslaved by Britain." And Comrade Koenen, of Germany, described the various activities of the Communist parties. "Wherever a fight is taking place, no matter whether it be the everyday or small conflicts of an insignificant local movement, the Communists must be there with their propaganda and agitation." Special tactics must be applied to clerks, etc., and if they cannot be persuaded to join the Communists, "then we should at least aim at their neutrality, as these strata will play a decisive rôle in the moment of the proletariat's struggle for power. Of course, the Press is the best method of propaganda and agitation, and the party should pay special attention to this." Comrade Koenen went on to deal with political activities,

> And pointed out that there was not a moment in any country when the Communist Party had no opportunity of taking part in political activities; experience shows us that such demonstrations as the British "Hands Off Russia" Committees and the Polish demonstrations during the advance of the Russian Army met with great success.

The 166 closely printed pages of this report impress the reader with the wide range of the operations of Moscow. Every possible phase of revolutionary activity is dealt with, and schemes are discussed for extending the propaganda of the Soviet in every country. A permanent secretariat has now been established at Moscow, and a General Staff of the World Revolution formed. Since this Congress was held sectional conferences have taken place at Moscow, at which the details of the schemes outlined at the Congress have been considered, and more precise instructions for the propaganda organisations have been agreed upon. There is no change or slackening in the activities of the Communist International.

THE GERMAN - BOLSHEVIK CONSPIRACY.

MR. EDGAR SISSON'S REPORT—VI.

OUR ILLUSTRATION.

We reproduce, as an apt illustration to our further instalment of Mr. Edgar Sisson's report, a typical page from an extraordinary book which has fallen into our hands. It is the work of a Russian artist, I. K. Arcibusheff, who was engaged or allowed by the Bolshevik Government to publish an album of portraits of leading Bolsheviks in December, 1917, and January, 1918. These "nature portraits," as the artist called them, were found to be so little to the taste of the sitters that the book (published in Moscow) was suppressed after only 500 copies had been printed. The horrible types it faithfully delineates remain as a graphic exposure of the horrible tyranny now reigning over Russia. But to continue our extracts from Mr. Edgar Sisson's report to the Public Information Committee of the Senate.

The following documents, with Mr. Sisson's interpretative notes, expose the German-Bolshevik plot against the Allies.

DOCUMENT NO. 16.

Counter Espionage at Army Headquarters, No. 215.

21 January, 1918.

To the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs:

We hereby advise you of the arrival in Mogilev of the following German officers, who are being ordered to England, France, and America:

Zanwald, von Weine, Pabst, Mayer, Gruenwaldt, and Baron Schilling. They have been granted passports, sent here by Commissar Trotsky.

Von Weine, with a Danish passport in the name of Hansen, a merchant of Copenhagen, is to proceed to England.

Baron Schilling is ordered to the United States of America with a Norwegian passport in the name of Dr. Joseph Brun.

Gruenwaldt has instructions to proceed to France with a Russian passport in the name of the Lett, Ivan Kalnin.

The remaining persons are to make a journey through Finland and Sweden, supplied with papers from the German staff, in order to follow up the counter revolutionary work of countries allied to us.

Chief of Counter Espionage: FEIBRABEND.
Commissar: VUZNETORFF.

NOTE.—A young German who said he was a deserting officer, and that his name was Mayer, sought the aid of the Embassy, the military mission, and myself, in getting to America. He was a good-looking young Prussian, had lived in New York, spoke English with very little accent, and claimed to have been converted to the President's views on peace requisites. He said he had walked across the lines as a deserter because he could stand no more of German war, and that he wanted to go to the United States to talk and write against Germany. I was not receptive. He said he was a lieutenant. There is no record at our military control office in Christiania of a passport to Dr. Joseph Brun.

Have photograph of letter.

DOCUMENT NO. 17.

Commissar for Combating the Counter Revolution and Pogroms, No. 32.

Petrograd,
January 5, 1918.

To the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs:

The plenipotentiary Commissar for Combating the Counter Revolution, Comrade Antonoff, requests the commissariat for foreign affairs to issue passports for going to Denmark to the following comrades, who are going to the allied countries to conduct peace propaganda:

To England are going: Comrades Adolf Pavlovich Ribba, Ilia Julievich Uritski, Vladislav Antonovich Dashkevich.

To France: Rimma Lvovna Orlova, Vladimir Konstantinovich Schneur.

To America: Isai Borisovich Kahn, Mark Vlasievich Gritsker, Sofia Arturovna Mack.

All the named comrades will visit at Copenhagen the premises of the staff, where they will receive neutral passports for the trip to the named countries. At the disposal of the dispatched will be placed the necessary means for combating in the Press with the Imperialists of England, France, and the United States. Their confidential addresses will be transmitted to you later on the arrival of the named comrades at the places of their destination.

Authorised commissars: A. SHILINSKI.
F. ZUBERT.

NOTE.—Trotsky endorsed this note: "To be urgently executed.—L.T."

The plan of peace propaganda campaign in the allied countries is plainly outlined. These Bolshevik-German agents will preach international Bolshevism, and will charge the countries at war with Germany with the very Imperialistic offences of which Germany is guilty. This also was the method used in Russia by the Bolshevik-German press in attacking the United States, England, and France. In the formula of the propaganda, Imperialism relates not only to territory but to business enterprise. The agents listed above likely songht entrance under different names. They and the centres from which they work should be recognised, however, by their words and their works. The commissars who sign are members of the Commission for Combating the Counter Revolution.

Have photograph of letter.

December 20, 1917.

DOCUMENT NO. 18.

G[reat] General Staff, Central Division, Section M, No. 951.

To the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs:

According to the negotiations between the Russian and German peace delegations at Brest-Litovsk, the Russian Division of the German General Staff have the honour to request the hastening of the departure of agitators to the camps of Russian prisoners of war in Germany, for the recruiting of volunteers who will be sent to the English and French troops for the purpose of observation and peace propaganda.

Simultaneously, the staff requests the following sailors to be sent to Germany: Shishko, Kirshu, Matviev, and Dratchuk. They will receive special instructions when travelling through Brest-Litovsk.

Chief of the Russian Division, German General Staff:
O. RAUSCH.

Adjutant: U. WOLFF.

NOTE.—This request was referred to the Commissariats on Military and Naval Affairs.

A marginal question asked by E. P. (probably Polivanoff): "[Is] Dratchuk at Black Sea?" He was at Sevastopol, and may not have been sent. The others went, visited the camps for war prisoners in Germany, and then returned to Russia. Shishko, in February, was Commissar of the Naval College in Petrograd

Have photograph of letter.

DOCUMENT NO. 19.

Counter Espionage at Army Headquarters, No.

January 16, 1918.

To the Council of People's Commissars:

I hereby bring to the notice of the Council of People's Commissaries that through our front, on the personal permission of the Supreme Commander, have passed 100 German officers, 250 non-commissioned officers, who proceeded to our internal fronts; part of the German officers have gone to the front in the Don region, part to the front against Dutoff, and part to Eastern Siberia and the Trans-Baikal for the surveillance, and if it shall be possible, to oppose the Japanese occupationary detachment and the counter revolutionary Trans-Baikal Cossack Officers.

Counter Espionage Official: P. ARKHIPOV.

NOTE.—An odd comment gives interest to this letter. It is this: "An accusation or a silly accusal for personal benefit? Communicate [Comrade Krilenko]."—Signed "N. G."

Have photograph of letter.

DOCUMENT NO. 20.

Counter Espionage at Army Headquarters, No. 52.

January 8, 1918.

To the Council of People's Commissars:

The Supreme Commander Krilenko has received an offer from the Supreme Commander of the German army to send to the disposal of the German Staff ten reliable officers of

the revolutionary army. The said persons must arrive at Warsaw, where they will receive their further instructions. The aim of the trip is to visit the camps of our prisoners of war on the propaganda of peace ideas. The staff points out the desirability of sending Dzevaltovsky, Simashko, Saharoff, and Volodarsky.

For the Chief of the Counter Espionage:
S. KALMANOVICH.

For the Commissar:
ALEXIEFF.

NOTE.—Dzevaltovsky was an officer of the Life Guards Grenadier Regiment, and an agitator who aroused the soldiers at the time of the ill-fated June advance. Volodarsky has been referred to previously. He was assassinated in late June at Moscow. Kalmanovich was a Commissar on the staff of Krilenko, the talking man who was assigned to disorganise the army. In actual army rank Krilenko was a sub-lieutenant.

Have photograph of letter.

DOCUMENT NO. 21.

Gr. General Staff, Central Division, Section M, No. 750.
Berlin, November 1, 1917.

To the Council of People's Commissars:

In accordance with an inquiry from the German General Headquarters, I have the honour to request you to inform me at the earliest possible moment the exact quantity of ammunition at the following places: Petrograd, Archangel, Kazan, Tiflis.

It is necessary also to state the quantity and storage place of the supplies which have been received from America, England and France, and also the units which are keeping guard over the military stores.

Head of Division: O. RAUSCH.
Adjutant: U. WOLFF.

NOTE.—This is a request made upon a country which America, England and France still regarded at that date as an ally.

Have photograph of letter.

DOCUMENT NO 22.

G[eneral] S[taff] of the High Sea Fleet, No. 79.
10 January, 1918.
(Very secret.)

To the Council of People's Commissars:

The Petersburg representative of the Supreme Sea Command has received by wireless from Kiel orders to propose to the Council of People's Commissars to place at the disposal of our agents at Vladivostok—Buttenhof, Staufacher, and Franz Walden—several steamships. On these ships must be loaded the goods indicated by our named agents, and also persons indicated by them, and be sent as directed to ports of the United States, Japan, and British colonies in Eastern Asia. In case of absence of free tonnage in Pacific ports, it is necessary to charter ships sailing under a foreign flag. The object of sending the ships is to carry to enemy countries agents-agitators, and agents-destructors. All the expenses and risk the Petrograd agency of the Supreme Naval Command takes for account of the naval operations fund. Capt.-Lieut. RUDOLPH MILLER.

NOTE.—The endorsement of Lenin's secretary Shripnik is: "Reported." The active Vladivostok agents have been referred to previously. The threat of the arrival of German agents through Pacific ports is apparent.

Have photograph of letter.

DOCUMENT NO. 23.

G[eneral] S[taff] of the High Sea Fleet, No. 85.
14 January, 1918.
(Very secret.)

To the Council of People's Commissars:

According to instructions of the German High Sea Command, transmitted to-day to me by radio A, I apply to the Russian Government with a proposal to take measures to deliver to the Pacific by railway three of our submarines, disassembled. On the conclusion of peace negotiations and the conclusion of peace between Russia and Germany, this transporting must be begun immediately, whereby on the conclusion of the war the transported vessels will remain at the disposal of the Russian Government.

Capt.-Lieut. RUD. MILLER.

NOTE.—The letter is endorsed: "Reported.—Secretary Skripnik." The transporting, according to the categorical demand, was to begin immediately after peace was signed. These are the only two communications of Capt. Miller that appear.

Have photograph of letter.

DOCUMENT NO. 24.

Commissar for Combating the Counter Revolution and Pogroms, No. 445/63.
Petrograd, January 21, 1918.

To the Commissar of War, Skilansky:

Our agency on the Furhstatskaya informs us that two people not seen before have been noticed to visit the American Embassy three times.

Major Luberts begs to point out to Commissioner Podvoisky the necessity of keeping a watch over the movements of these two persons. I ask your instructions.

Commissar: A. KOZMIN.

NOTE.—Major Luberts believed in identifying visitors to the American Embassy. Podvoisky was the Minister of War.

Have photograph of letter.

DOCUMENT NO. 25.

G. G.-S., Intelligence Bureau, Section R. No. 168.
December 17, 1917.
(Very Secret.)

To the Commissar on Foreign Affairs:

At the request of the Commission on Combating the Counter Revolution of December 17, the Intelligence

BOLSHEVIK TYPES.

1. **KRAMAPOFF (Social Democrat—Internationalist).**
2. **LENIN (Ulianoff) President of the Commissaries of the People (Bolshevik).**
3. **AVANESSOFF, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers and Soldiers (Bolshevik).**
4. **GORDIN (Anarchist).**

Bureau has the honour to forward a list of men watching the missions of the countries allied to Russia:

The British Embassy is watched by German scouts Luze, Telman, Possel, Franz, and Gezel; Russian agents Ovisannikov, Gluschenko, and Baliasin.

The French Embassy is watched by German scouts Silvester, Butz, Folhagen; Russian agents Balashev, Turin, Gavrilov, Sadavnokov, and Shilo.

The U.S.A. Embassy is watched by German scouts Strom, Buchholtz, Fasnacht, Todner; Russian agents Spitzberg, Sokolnizky, Turasov, and Vavilov.

The Roumanian mission is watched by German scouts Suttner, Baider, Wolf; Russian agents Kuhl, Nikitin, Zolotov, and Arkipov.

The Italian Embassy is watched by Austrian scouts Kuhlder, von Geze, Goin, and Burmeister; Russian agents Salov, Alekseievsky, and Kuzmin.

These agents must fulfil all instructions of the Commission for Combating the Counter Revolution, Sabotage, Looting, etc.

Head of Bureau: AGASFER.
Adjutant: E. RANTZ.

NOTE.—The German Major Luberts (Agasfer, see Document No. 5), therefore was the keeper of Ambassadorial hostages of the allied countries in Russia throughout the winter. The names listed above were unidentifiable in the establishments of at least the British and the American Embassies. All may have been outside watchers. The method of outside surveillance is shown in Document No. 27.

Have photograph of letter.

(To be continued.)

THE CONCHY IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

AN INFAMOUS DOCUMENT.

The report of the Parliamentary Select Committee appointed to consider the rival claims of conscientious objectors or ex-Service men to State employment has just been issued. It shows that the proceedings of the Committee were dominated throughout by Civil Service bureaucrats and Labour Party officials. The resultant injustice to the ex-Service men seems never for an instant to have been in doubt. However harsh may appear the word "infamous," it would be hard to find another adjective so truly applicable to this document. Although probably 99 per cent. of the English race would rejoice to see ex-Service men turned into State servants, the decision of the report, briefly stated, is that the fighting men must starve, and that the nation saved by their valour must be heavily income-taxed to pay the salaries of Civil Service conscientious objectors, because they are political allies of the Labour Party. The cruelty and danger of bureaucratic tyranny revealed by this report can scarcely be overstated, but even these are not its greatest evils. The unique infamy lies in the official recognition it gives to national servants who have insulted national honour.

These established Civil Service conscientious objectors were the men who, though they had eaten the bread of England all their lives, chose during the war to besmirch the fair fame of the nation. These were the men who brought upon England the shame of the taunt of cowardice, never until then thrown at the English race. These are the people in whose favour the report decides against the claim of that band of brothers who held the Ypres salient, who stormed Vimy's bloody ridges, and in the grudging praise of the German General Staff, "Achieved the impossible" in the landing at Y beaches at Gallipoli.

Looking back at those anti-conscriptionist days, nothing is now clearer than that there would have been no conscientious objectors had there been no anti-patriotic speeches by Radical and Labour politicians, and had enormous sums of money not been pumped into the movement for the purpose of paying for conscience training classes and mock tribunals.

As a member of the Select Committee, Mr. J. H. Thomas championed the cause of the conscientious objectors throughout. It is of interest to recall his utterances at a time during the war when he must have known that defeat was certain if compulsory service were not adopted. They were the stock-in-trade of the defeatist Press :—

> "Mr. Thomas's warning that the railways would be stopped in protest against compulsion reduced the Conscriptionists to silence."—(*Daily News*, 18 September, 1915.)

It would be hard to find a threat more wicked. At a time when troops abroad were being heavily outnumbered the Labour Party was prepared to betray them by disorganising railway transport in rear of the British Army. Mr. Thomas's utterances follow :—

> "In reference to the railway industry, the evidence is that not another man can go from the railways. Too many have gone already. . . . In my organisation every branch has not only passed resolutions against conscription, but indicated their views of what should be done. . . . If you could not put the Munition Act in operation against 200,000 men, what is going to happen with three million men? They are entitled to their own opinion as well as you, and there is the further answer that we conscientiously object to compulsory service."—(Mr. J. H. Thomas, M.P., "Parliamentary Debates," 16 September, 1915.)

The enormous expenditure of cash and cant on anti-conscription produced such an orgy of falsehood and hypocrisy that even the Press revolted against allowing the replies of the conscientious objectors to appear in print. There was the postal sorter who told a tribunal that his conscience forbade his becoming a hospital orderly, because, by helping to save the life of a British soldier, he would only be helping him "to murder" more Germans, which would not happen if "the hired assassin" died. There was that other pure-souled youth who announced that as his "inner light" had revealed the wickedness of war, he felt it would be mortal sin to touch a stretcher; but who, when questioned by the tribunal, admitted, a little unwillingly, that he was a War Office clerk, but said he did not think that was wrong, as he had made it a matter of prayer, and knew no other way of earning his living. There was the young postman who said he would "rather be shot than shoot," meaning he would sooner face the shame of imprisonment here than the risk of German shells in France, and who, when his appeal was dismissed, burst into tears, and begged the tribunal to "shoot me now." A young sorter earning £7 5s. a week, plus bonus and overtime, told a tribunal he could not be a hospital orderly, because, he said, he might release "some lukewarm Christian" to become a combatant. There was the young second-class clerk who told a tribunal that if he saw a torpedo about to strike a passenger-crowded liner his conscience would not allow its removal, because the Government would not permit him to interfere with mines laid outside British harbours; and the case of another conscientious objector, who told the tribunal that if he saw a German killing his own mother he "would carry on and not interfere." The above cases, taken from a mass of Press reports in 1916, 1917, and 1918, all refer to Civil Service conscientious objectors. Not one in a hundred was not obviously insincere. Another class of Civil Service conscientious objectors based their claim for exemption, not on religious grounds, but on their "right" to regard themselves as hostile to the nation which was paying them salaries far in excess of the average working-class income.

The replies of this class of Civil Service conscientious objector mostly showed that craze for insulting English national sentiment which is so marked a characteristic of the Labour Party. One young sorter, on being asked by the tribunal whether he would not fight if the Germans landed, answered : "No, I would sooner fight the people here." Another sorter, on refusal to join the R.A.M.C., and on being asked : "Would you let a British soldier who might recover lie on the battlefield?" replied : "Yes, it would teach him a lesson not to be one of the paid hirelings of the capitalist class." Other replies included : "I am not proud of being an Englishman," while one of the commonest was : "All the country I have got is the dirt I scrape off my boot heels." A reference appears in the report of the Select Committee to these anti-national

national servants in the evidence of a Labour witness called on behalf of the conscientious objectors:

503. Do you know of any sect besides Quakers and Christadelphians whose belief involves repudiation of all military service?

No, but I know men of no religious belief at all, people of no adherence to any particular creed, who would.

504. Who do not like the idea of soldiering?

That is not fair; do be fair to them. Not that they do not like the idea of soldiering, but who regard it as wrong, not from any question of a personal disinclination to fight.—(Minutes of Evidence, 21 March, 1922.)

The claim of this class of established Civil Servant is that their allegiance is due only to their class as public servants, which bestows an international status. During the last year of the war a number of these non-British officials were much in evidence, owing to their refusal to take the oath of allegiance to the King, which at that time was ordered to be administered to all persons serving in Government departments. R. H. G.

AN OVERHEARD CONVERSATION.

MASON: "Sorry, Bill, this 'ere job's done. Addison weren't such a bad bloke arter all said."

CARPENTER: "Yes, George; and it's a d——d shame they got rid of 'im."

PLUMBER: "No good a-crying over spilt milk, but wot abaht the next job? Mind you, same price and same hours—that what *I'm* looking for."

MASON: "Well, old Dot (the contractor) tells me (in confidence, mind ye) that none of the gentry will quote him a job as long as the income-tax is six shilling: *he* believes as how they ain't got the dough."

CARPENTER: "More they ain't; and what does that blighter Ll. George spend this six shilling on? A lot of —— officials!"

PLUMBER: "Well, he give us Addison, anyhow."

MASON: "Yes, and then the blighter goes back on us and sacks him."

CARPENTER: "He's overdone the job business, anyway, George. Just you cast your eye 'ow many of our pals are in it; never done and never will do a honest day's work; just draws out forms and tries collecting money. It's too easy, and look at we sweating."

PLUMBER: "'E'll find it out; he loses twenty votes for every one job. Why, I tell yer my missus is in a women's institute, secretary, and she 'as half a dozen officials bringing of her forms to fill; and they ain't no use, nor the blokes what bring them, 'cept to eat up the taxes."

MASON: "What's he want at Genoa, anyway, shaking hands with these —— Bolshies for?"

PLUMBER: "Well, Bill, 'e won the war anyhow—by gum, he did!"

MASON: "P'r'aps, but I cu'd have done it cheaper. I was in the munition business, so I knows. That's wot we're paying the price for whisky and beer to-day for, to pay his dirty waste in munitions. I was there, so I knows. We're in a place for heroes to live in, I don't think."

CARPENTER: "Officials to live in you means."

PLUMBER: "*And* bonuses, too. Genoa's a red herring, Ireland's a red herring. *I'm* voting for less taxes and less officials."

LETTERS OF A PATRIOT—VI.

Delightful task! to rear the tender thought,
And teach the young idea how to shoot.

Sir,—If the poet who wrote these lines could examine our present national education in practice he would probably revise his opinion. Our trade union of teachers is to a large extent so rearing the tender thought that patriotism will disappear from its horizon, and have its place taken by Internationalism-cum-Socialism, plus Materialism. And the delightful task is being carried out at the expense of the taxpayers, without any reference to their choice of the kind of a country they would like this to be in future. The poet would certainly think to-day that the Socialist Sunday Schools and the Red Proletarian Schools, in their cultivation of class hatred, were teaching the young idea how to shoot in another sense of the word.

Many searchlights have been turned lately on to the Red schools, and the Press have helped to make known their works: but these schools, however objectionable and dangerous in their teaching, are *visibly* opposed to the convictions of the public in general, while their number is not large, so that exposure may lead to remedies. The permeation of the teaching class as a whole by Socialism is a much greater danger from its insidious character, and from the fact of its being hidden from, or ignored by, politicians, the Press, and the people who pay the piper, but do not call the tune.

Numbers of the clergy are no longer reliable defenders of the people against the doctrine of "Class Consciousness." They have been deluded by phrases and half-truths into the acceptance of a kind of sugar-coated Socialism which appears consistent with Christianity at first sight. An association called the *Industrial Christian Fellowship*, with the backing of fifty "Labour" leaders, is circularising the clergy for the organising of special services "to remind workers of the sanctity and dignity of labour." This Association is being used by the Socialist (Labour) Party to forward its home and foreign policy and to help establish the claim of one class to a privileged position as alone entitled to call itself "Labour," although the right depends merely on the control of the machinery of part of the trade unions of the country, with a combined membership of about one-quarter of all the various workers. And the great majority even of that one-quarter is quite ignorant of, or indifferent to, the incessant political activities of those claiming to speak for it.

The most active workers for Socialism at present were Pacifists in the war, and have remained pro-Germans since—a very poor testimony to their judgment of what is good for this country. I have seen the prospectus of a preparatory school which is known to be distinctly anti-patriotic in its influences; and, sure enough, in the list of references are the names of M.P.s and others with damning records in our days of peril. Inside our Universities themselves great efforts are being made to undermine the old patriotic and constitutional traditions and the corporate University spirit.

Cleared of big words and some pseudo-science, the pathetic faith in the possibilities of legislation by the sincere among our modern reformers does not differ from Shakespeare's version of the Socialism of Jack Cade, in ruling that "*There shall be in England seven halfpenny loaves sold for a penny; the three-hooped pot shall have ten hoops; and I will make it felony to drink small beer; all the Realm shall be in common.*"—Yours faithfully,

A. P.

THE OUTLOOK IN IRELAND.

Chocolate Soldiers.

Judging from the accounts published in the Press, it might be said that Easter week passed over in comparative quiet, yet rumour told of wild bursts of shooting each night exceeding in violence anything heard during the Rebellion of 1916. Even allowing for inevitable exaggeration, the turn events took towards the end of the week, culminating in an outburst against militarism by the Lord Mayor, and the declaration of a general strike by way of protest, shows that on this occasion truth was on the side of rumour, and that the Press, wholly Free State in sympathy and probably influenced by the violent measures adopted by the I.R.A. to restrict the publication of anything unfavourable to their views, made every attempt to minimise the seriousness of the situation, which was described at the Labour meeting: "The seeds of militarism were being sown to-day. No man's life or property was safe under it, one could not walk the streets of Dublin without being assailed by military motors filled with men with their guns at the 'ready.' Fusillades by night disturbed the citizens' rest, men and women as well as children were terrified. The latest indignity and humiliation offered to the people was that they were being held up and searched. Who was responsible for that? Judging by statements that are made, it would seem that reason, sanity, and common sense had departed." Responsibility for the shootings and violence is repudiated by both the Free Staters and the I.R.A.; it is attributed solely to armed bands of hooligans. If this is true, the responsibility must surely rest with the Provisional Government in allowing armed bands to hold up the ordinary life of the community and endanger trade and industry, which are slowly but surely being ruined. "At present Ireland is the most militarised country in Europe. There were soldiers and would-be soldiers everywhere, in uniform, in mufti, in stolen motor-cars. The outstanding feature of the opposing armies was the predominance of the officer class. Commandant-generals, major-generals and brigadiers were as numerous as mushrooms after a summer shower. It would look as if the only people who had a chance of getting on were crazy theorists, muddle-headed philosophers, and chocolate soldiers." This description strikes the true note that the present troubles are largely due to the inordinate conceit of those who have now got power or see the chance of rising to power in the country.

The Octopus.

The most positive proof of the terrible state of anarchy prevailing is afforded by the startling suddenness with which a campaign of protest was organised. In the Dublin Corporation the Lord Mayor said, "Diabolical transactions were happening in the city night after night; it was up to the people of this country to kill the octopus of militarism." The Hierarchy have issued a strong condemnation. The Dublin Chamber of Commerce held a meeting of protest, and a body called the All-Ireland Ratepayers' Association published a vehement manifesto protesting against the present chaotic conditions: "The great slump in trade and industry and the conseqent unemployment should now be engaging the serious attention of our legislators instead of rifles, bombs, and machine guns. The tyrannies which we have had to endure through the force majeure of a foreign despot cannot be tolerated when imposed by our own people." The last sentence gives an inkling as to the political views of the majority of the members of this body, of which little had previously been heard. But the most striking form of protest was the declaration of a general strike by the Executive of the Irish Labour Party. Although the protest was directed against the failure of the Provisional Government to suppress militarism, no proposal was made as to the manner in which the Government was to assert its authority without a very determined military effort, faced as it is by the hostile army of the "mutinous" I.R.A. strongly posted in Dublin, and supreme in many parts of the South. The suggestion made that the separate forces should unite can now only be carried out, so bitter have differences become, on the basis of a Republic and the "scrapping" of the Treaty; "the Free Staters and the I.R.A. will have no difficulty in coming to an agreement if the British Government pledges itself to respect whatever decision the Irish people may arrive at, even should that decision be for a Republic."

A Labour Demonstration.

The stoppage was proclaimed in a manifesto, which set out: "We have protested against the growth of the idea that the military forces may take command of the civil life of the nation without responsibility to the people; that military men may commit acts of violence against civilians and be immune from prosecution or punishment; that the possession of arms is the sole title to political authority. The country demands of the Dail that it should assert its authority and accept the responsibilities of Government or confess its impotence and make way for the people." At meetings held in many parts of the country this view was strongly emphasised that the Dail should either get on with the Government or get out and allow "Irish labour to set up the necessary authoritative power to protect the lives and the needs of the people."

Although the speeches at the various meetings give vivid descriptions of the state of anarchy to which the country has been reduced, the question persistently arises whether the strike was a genuine protest against militarism or whether it was a policy adopted, on a favourable opportunity offering itself, to show the power of Labour and to make it clear that the new Government, whatever its form may be, must obey the dictates of Labour. Twice previously the same policy was adopted, and on each occasion the Labour executive was able to boast that it had brought the Government of the day to its knees. It is not unlikely, therefore, that, a suitable occasion having arisen, a desire that the Government, at the very beginning of its career, should be made to realise that Labour was a force whose wishes have to be obeyed was uppermost in formulating the policy of the party. On no previous occasion was the stoppage of work so complete as in the present instance, not merely ordinary work and transport, but legal and banking business was suspended. One case is ominous for the future. The Postal Authorities directed that telegraph and telephone departments should be kept open, but they had to submit to the orders of the Postal Union and close down except for hospital business, thus affording the first instance of a Government department submitting to the decrees of a Labour executive in its purpose of making the Government toe the line.

The ostensible motive of the stoppage undoubtedly contributed to its success. To such a state of confusion and disorder has the country fallen that any

sufficiently powerful organisation coming forward in such a spirit would have received almost unanimous support, regardless of the future developments of the policy. As an instance of this, one of the leading men in Dublin in a speech hailed the proposed stoppage as evidencing a coalition between Capital and Labour for preserving the trade of the country from the threat of destruction, yet a speaker at the Labour meeting, who described himself as a Republican because he believed that the things Labour was out for could be more readily achieved under a Republican form of government, made it clear that this view was Utopian by asserting that in no event would Labour link up with the employers, but that Labour would fight the employers as well as the military movement.

A Communist Manifesto.

The preliminary manifesto states: "We demand of both parties that they should unite to honour the pledge they gave when Dail Eireann solemnly proclaimed the Democratic Programme as the social policy of the Republic, a pledge which should take precedence over any pledge to a foreign Government or any pledge to maintain a particular form of government." This programme, issued in 1919, was not published in Ireland owing to the censorship, and is hard to trace except from extracts quoted at various times. It began with a solemn declaration of Irish independence, and the clause apparently referred to runs: "We declare the nation's sovereignty extends not only to all the men and women of the nation, the nation's soil and all its resources, all the wealth and wealth-producing processes of the nation, and we affirm that all right to private property must be subordinated to the public right and welfare of the nation. We affirm the right and duty of every man and woman to give allegiance and service to the Commonwealth, and declare it as the duty of the nation to ensure that every citizen shall have the opportunity to spend his or her strength in the service of the people. In return for willing service we declare the right of every citizen to an adequate share of the produce of the nation's labour," bearing a striking resemblance to many parts of the Russian Soviet Constitution. It has frequently been alleged that in accepting the Treaty Ireland will only be exchanging one form of capitalist domination for another, and this seems to be the most rational charge that has yet been levied against the Treaty. As late as last September one of the Executive of the Labour Party stated their policy: "They in the Labour movement gave their allegiance to the Republican Government, but they knew the Republic they wanted. They wanted the Republic that Connolly worked, lived, and died for." [He was executed for the part he took in the Rebellion of 1916.] "They wanted the establishment of a Workers' Republic." The same policy was outlined last February at the Congress held to decide the part Labour was to take at the forthcoming election, and a speech recently reported contains the statement: "It does not matter to the workers of the country whether de Valera or Griffith is in power. The workers of Dublin in 1916 fought for a Workers' Republic, and towards the achievement of that aim they should work. The Red Flag was their flag, and they would stand by it by every means in their power." The whole policy of Labour then seems, not merely to be directed against militarism, but to be an attempt to make the Government feel the strength of Labour, and to compel it to develop its policy on anti-capitalist lines.

It has been pointed out that the opposition is directed against militarism, not against the use of military force, which is regarded as necessary and desirable under certain circumstances. "Many in Irish Labour will go so far as to say that under certain circumstances an armed force of the workers is necessary, but there is a vital distinction between this and militarism." The whole policy is in a great degree consistent with that outlined in the address of Marx to the League of Communists, published in 1850, which appears to have been the guide of the Bolshevists and Spartacists.

History shows very few cases in which any form of settled Government was established after a revolution except by the creation of a Dictatorship of some kind, and the present situation in Ireland seems to have developed into a struggle between the various parties to obtain this position. The policy of the Labour movement is very probably influenced by the fear that in the struggle their particular interests would be overlooked, unless some definite and striking move was made to bring their organisation into line with the other factions, which have the additional advantage of being supported by armed forces.

There are now four principal parties in Ireland, or five, if the British Government is considered: two armed forces, the Free Staters and Republicans, and during the last week two unarmed forces have come to the forefront representing Labour and the stable elements in the country. The whole future prosperity of Ireland depends on which of these parties, or what combination of these parties, predominates for the future.

The Election Campaign.

In the meantime the election campaign continues with fiery eloquence on both sides and considerable interruption at pro-Treaty meetings, but from column after column of reports of meetings that appear in the Press nothing new can be gathered. Pro-Treaty speakers strongly emphasise the absence of all finality in the Treaty. Mr. Collins said: "My ideal remains a free and independent Ireland, and under the present arrangement with England we can secure it." "By developing the country and going ahead to the fulfilment of Irish destinies was the road to the Republic." Another speaker said: "The Treaty did not bar their country from further advancement, and if within twenty-four hours they got another chance it would be their right and duty to avail of it." The Republican argument, on the other hand, depends on the finality of the Treaty, and that the country is in honour bound to stand by the terms. This one question, the finality of the Treaty, is the crux of the whole situation, and it can be said with almost absolute certainty that if the Republican view is correct, the Treaty would never have, and can never, satisfy any but a very small minority of the Free Staters. But the British Government is also a party to the Treaty, a fact largely forgotten in Ireland, where it is regarded as the vanquished in one of the most heroic wars in all history. What is needed is a strong declaration of Government policy upon this vital question.

It is not sufficient to say that the dispute is a purely Irish one, the settlement of which only involves the wasting of Irish blood and Irish money. The honour and dignity of the Empire cannot remain unstained in the eyes of the world if the Government, for the sake of political expediency, allow part of the Empire to be hurled "to a hell of anarchy and fratricidal strife." The infection would almost inevitably spread, and the same forces are at work in other parts of the Empire as in Ireland, which would make the spread of the infection rapid, while the essential work of reconstruction after the war and the development of trade must be retarded, if not absolutely destroyed, by any such fatal policy.

THE WAYS OF TRADE UNIONS.

In spite of the eternal discussions in the Press about Labour unrest, the public are only occasionally and incidentally informed of the basic facts of the tyranny, and of the destructive objects, of the politically corrupted trade unions—the only ones the public hear much about—for there are many unions legitimately run, and which are therefore not enemies of the community. The following sample of the attacks on freedom of the worker, and on the prosperity of industry in general, is one of hundreds of cases regularly occurring throughout the country.

A highly skilled mechanic called A has been for eleven years a member of his craft union, and actively interested in the advantages of trade unionism. He was for a time foreman in a works employing 200 men. In a recently proposed strike for trivial reasons he was so opposed to the plans of a few extreme officials that he left the union; and from that time every effort was made to drive him out of the shop and out of employment, even to threatening a strike if he were not discharged. On one occasion he was given a certain apparatus to make, consisting of several parts, and finished it at ordinary speed of working in 60 hours' actual time. The inspection department—under members of the union—returned the work twice for trivial reasons, and he saw on the second return that it was evident his time had been too short for union ideals; so he left the work alone until the total hours reached 140, when he put it in again for inspection, and it was passed. Another man, B, was taking 160 hours on the same piece of work. A new manager was put in charge of the shop, who insisted on larger output all round; and A—so as not to create more persecution against himself—consulted B about the extent they should reduce their hours on their particular jobs. B replied that he would not reduce below 160 hours, so A did not shorten his time. Meantime B had reduced his hours to 75, so as to get A into trouble; and he nearly succeeded, for the new manager told the foreman to discharge A. But the foreman explained that A was really a good man, and should be retained and be told the position; on which A reduced his hours to 60. A now says it is impossible to be in a trade union and do an honest day's work; and he is done with unions for good.

Can a system, or a country, flourish on such tyranny, injustice, and dishonesty? The ill-informed people who think the Socialists who are running the Labour Party in this country are representing a down-trodden and ill-paid class must rearrange their whole view of the everlasting "Labour" question. While our politicians and newspapers are gibbering about the rights of Labour to organise and the ill-deeds of employers, the Socialists are using the organised for the deliberate purpose of destroying industry under Capitalism.

BIRDS OF A FEATHER.

A meeting in London of a number of Indians, Mr. O'Brien Kennedy (Irish Self-Determination League) and Mr. D. Jackson (Communist Party) declared "Unabated confidence in Mahatma Gandhi and other leaders struggling for Swaraj; welcomed the solidarity of the Moslems of the world; expressed sympathy and promised hearty co-operation with non-Islamic peoples in struggles for national freedom in India, Turkey, Egypt, and elsewhere; and sent sincere good wishes to the people of Ireland for the attainment of complete freedom from external control."

CORRESPONDENCE.

NOTE.—While inviting correspondence, the Editor takes no responsibility for the opinions expressed.

A REVIEWER REVIEWED.

Dean Inge on the Jews.

To the Editor.

Sir,—In the *Evening Standard* of April 27 Dean Inge reviewed Mr. Belloc's book on the Jews. The doughty Dean couches his lance and challenges Mr. Belloc—who, like Sir Brian de Bois Guilbert, does not detest the whole Jewish race—to mortal combat. Much printer's ink will probably be spilt before this duel is brought to a conclusion.

"We in England," says the Dean, "know nothing of a Jewish problem." Yet St. Paul's is not so far from Whitechapel! I advise the Dean to take a trip to the East End, and ask some Christian Englishmen whether his statement is justified. On the way he might consult some Christian English bankers and stockbrokers.

Dean Inge complains that Mr. Belloc, when "mentioning the expulsion of the Jews from England by Edward I.," does not "tell us what the Jews themselves thought about it." According to the Dean, the Jews attributed their expulsion to "the Papal merchants and the Pope's usurers, who had supplanted them."

It may be so, but I had hitherto thought that Edward I. was a strong-willed, straightforward, and reasonably truthful monarch. From the Calendar of Close Rolls (Edward I., Vol. III., p. 109) I venture to quote an entry dated November 5, 1290:—

"To the treasurer and barons of the exchequer,—Whereas the King in his parliament at Westminster at the quinzaine of Michaelmas, in the third year of his reign, ordained that no Jew of the realm should thenceforth lend anything in usury to any Christian upon lands, rents, or other things, but should earn his living by trade and labour, and the Jews afterwards, maliciously deliberating amongst themselves, changed the kind of usury into a worse, which they called 'courtesy' *(curialitatem)*, and depressed the King's people under colour of such by an error double that of the previous one; wherefore the King, by reason of their errors and for the honour of Christ, has caused the Jews to leave his realm as perfidious men, etc."

In this official document, which purports to give Edward's reasons, there is nothing about "Papal merchants" and "Pope's usurers." Still, official documents, as we know to our cost, are not always reliable, and the Jewish view may be correct. Personally, I prefer Edward I.'s version. He was a soldier who risked his life in the Holy Land, France, England, Wales, and Scotland. The Jews expelled by him were, admittedly, usurers. Chacun à son goût!

To Dean Inge "race-consciousness is a rather silly thing." But does that happen to be the view of the average Jew? He is rightly proud of belonging to a race which has survived the ancient Egyptians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Greeks, Carthaginians, and Romans, and may survive even the English. I do not blame, and have never blamed, the Jews for their race-consciousness, but for promoting internationalism in others when they are ardent nationalists themselves. As for race-consciousness, it is one of nature's devices for ensuring race-continuance: it is, like patriotism, the instinct of survival. Nature, when she gave the nations race-consciousness, knew what she was about, for, impossible as it may appear, she is even wiser than Dean Inge.—I am etc.,

PRO-ENGLISH.

MR. EDGAR SISSON'S REPORT.

Ludendorff's Opinion.

Sir,—Your No. 8, of March 30, lies before me. I refer to lines 24 ff. of the left column of first page and your articles on the Sisson report, and specially on the facsimiles on page 8.

After first perusal I had a good, hearty laugh; and then I thought I better ought to get expert advice on what you say. I beg leave to translate only one letter I got in reply to my queries:—

"All news relating to any joint conspiracy of German military offices (or officers, officials: 'Dienststellen') with bolshewists is an absolute lie. The alleged document No. 3 bears openly the stamp of falsification, and is a monstrous idiocy ('ungeheuerlicher Blödsinn').

"The employment of all means in warfare cannot be avoided. I do not believe that the means referred to has ever been used."

This letter is dated 20 April, and is from Ludendorff.

The general storm against Ludendorff (compare f.e. *The Times* of Thursday, 20th inst., with its leader "The Unholy Alliance" and two letters, one by a jew Sichel) in all papers of all countries are but the result of Ludendorff having dared to publish a book, "Warfare and Politics," in which he exposed the pan-jewish scheme. An article on "Who sent Lenin to Russia?" in No. 83 of 4 February, 1922, page 1142 of *Plain English* will give yon a pretty complete review of Ludendorff's book and other writings.

When, at first sight, I recognise an alleged "facsimile" as a preposterous falsification, and when the first man in the world who really knows declares the same as a monstrous idiocy, you will permit me, sir, to regard also the remainder of the Sisson report as, what it is, a dam jewish lie.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Yours obedient servant,

KURT KERLEN,

A real and genuine German; one who is proud to be a German.

24 April, 1922.

[To evidence so obviously disinterested we cannot refuse credence! At the same time we are bound to remember that Mr. Sisson's documents (1 to .53) were examined and found to be genuine by the New York National Board for Historic Service.—Editor, *Patriot*.]

THE TEACHERS' CONFERENCE.

Sir,—A few of the utterances of the so-called representatives of the National Union of Teachers, at their annual Educational Conference here, may be of interest. Here are a few extracts of the President's speech: "The insistent wailing of 'tax-shirking wealth' for relief from the social burdens it ought to bear"—"Provide for the conquest of power in factory and workshop." "It is only national capital that can finance successfully this national business. Private venture is doomed to failure. Let there be no mistake on this point: education is a social service and the school is a social agent"—"will provide the antidote to the enslaving necessity of mass production." Counsellor J. R. Walker (London, N.W.) said "they objected to any body of business men concerning themselves with the education of this country. Education was the last thing of which they had any real knowledge—he had realised that business men secured their Parliamentary seats, not because they had done a lot for their country but because they had done their country for a lot—they possessed the mentality of a semi-developed rabbit and the spirituality of a louse." (Loud laughter.) Mr. M. Jackson (London) said "the restriction of education as proposed would injure the children of men who had fought for the millionaires in the Great War"—(applause)—and there was much more of the same frothy stuff which met with loud applause. It is easy to recognise some of these gentry, who without doubt wermed themselves amongst the teachers years ago, just as members of the same gang found their way into the Labour Party long ago. They no more represent the teachers than do their comrades the working men. But what of the real teachers who loudly applauded such remarks. Are they fit to teach our children? The danger is great. The Bishop of Exeter said: "They would grow up into a new world—a world greatly different from the one they knew now." He also spoke for Internationalism instead of Nationalism. It may be of interest to some of your readers to learn that the Torquay Charity Organisation Society has been influenced to spread Socialist ideas and to teach others to spread them for the good of the community. A page in their annual report sets forth their aims. Thus do the insidious methods of our enemies work.

Torquay, April 22, 1922. H. W. W.

THE REIGN OF ANTICHRIST.

("No. 12," April 27.)

Sir,—In the last number of your most valuable magazine I was struck with a letter from Lieut.-Colonel Beale on "The Reign of Anti-Christ"—a letter calculated to open men's eyes and to set them thinking. I venture, however, to suggest to the writer of that letter that it contains one statement that is not correct, though it is frequently made, and during the late war was repeated over and over again. I refer to the statement "*Armageddon is over.*" A study of the Apocalypse, chapters 13 to 16, makes it clear that "Armageddon" is the name applied to the final and decisive conflict between Christ and Anti-Christ, and necessarily occurs at the end of the reign of the latter. This view of the order of events does not at all weaken Col. Beale's timely word of warning and his earnest appeal; for it confirms his statement that the reign of Anti-Christ is already within sight, and is about to be in full development.

1 May, 1922. S. H.

A GLOSSARY OF POLITICAL AND LABOUR TERMS.

No. 13

As there is a demand for definition of many terms recently introduced in journalism, a column has been devoted weekly to this purpose. With the current number this Glossary is brought to a conclusion.

THE RED PRESS.

The Revolution, a monthly journal for education of young Socialists:—

"We are out to bring the Revolution. It means a four hours' working day, and equal rights and equal pay for all in the Industrial Republic."

The Red Dawn. Published by the Proletarian School, Glasgow, for "the abolition of the Capitalist State and the inauguration of an Industrial Republic":—

"News comes of hundreds of thousands of men on strike throughout Great Britain and of the hoisting of the Red Flag on the mast of a British man-o'-war. . . . Is it the **Red Dawn?**"

Solidarity. Advocate of the Rank-and-File Movement, and of the I.W.W., "which knows what it is out for and stops at nothing." It has no use for the moderate members of the Labour Party, but says:—

"The present-day Labour Party is tainted at its source, and without hesitation I state that a Labour Cabinet composed of the type of Henderson, Clynes, Hodge, Barnes, etc., would be far worse than the Cabinet we have in power at the present moment. * It behoves the energetic ones in the Rank-and-File Movement to use their influence to get the reactionary trade-union leaders relegated to obscurity, where their fluent and baneful tongues can no longer add to the misery and suffering of the workers."

The Socialist, organ of the S.L.P., was suppressed during February, 1916: "Renegade Tillett tries to sneak back! Ben Tillett, the Hun-chasing variety artist of the Great War period, shows signs of returning sanity after his war debauch."

May, 1919: "Let us this year pledge ourselves to work for Revolution, organise for Revolution, fight for Revolution, and sing for Revolution, if sing we must. At all events the opportunity is here."

"Revolution is absolutely necessary before Socialism can be established, therefore our road is clear. . . . We should stimulate discontent, foment revolt, fan the flames of strife against Capitalism, transform every agitation into a challenge to Capitalism—along these lines are revolutionary situations created. . . . Your task is to fight. Get on with it."

The Spur:—

January, 1920: "What we want is not more work, but less work. If we did less work and fewer hours, there would at least be a chance of work for all who wished it, instead of perpetual toil for some and starvation for others. It should be the avowed principle of every trade-unionist to work as few hours as possible, making the 6-hour-day and the 5-day week one of the immediate goals. So that weaker brethren, not so blessed in health and strength, do not have to compete with the full resources of your brawn and muscles.

The U.D.C.:—

August, 1918: "How long before the forces in favour of negotiations are strong enough to compel the Government 'to stop the massacres'? International Labour is the master of the Government, not their servants. Germany is fighting in self-defence."

The Worker.—Originally **The Clyde Worker** (suppressed in February, 1916). "During the war the Government adopted every device to make us hate the Germans. They **preached bitterness.** In time of war the man who goes over to the other side is—if caught—shot. The workers are at war. The other side is armed to the teeth and is prepared to shoot down any number of workers 'to encourage the others.' Blacklegs from our own ranks cannot be tolerated. * * No forgiveness, therefore; no letting bygones be bygones. No forgetfulness. The class war is a bitter reality. In war it is not the duty of one side to love the other, but to oppose it."

The Workers' Dreadnought:—

July, 1918: "Trade-union officials who have accepted Government positions must not be permitted to re-enter the Labour Movement when this ghastly crime is over. Place not your faith in officials, leaders, politicians, Press, or pulpit. Let us with the development of the **Workers' Committees** learn to rely more on ourselves.

The Young Rebel:—

July, 1918: "Capitalism is the only enemy of the workers. There is one war, and one war only—Capitalism against Labour. There are thousands of young men who are defying military service, because they are aware that Capitalists are trying to force them to join the Army, not to win the war, but to keep the working class in subjection. These young men are remaining true and brave to the cause of Socialism."

(Concluded.)

THE PATRIOT

No. 13.—Vol. 1. 4 MAY, 1922. PRICE SIXPENCE.
REGISTERED AT THE G.P.O. AS A NEWSPAPER.

THE PATRIOT.

THE PATRIOT was started on 9th February, 1922, with the idea of informing the public of the movements which threaten the safety and welfare of the British Empire, movements the dangers of which are either concealed or made light of in the majority of newspapers.

The trial period of three months expires with the current issue, and the very favourable reception given to the paper, as well as its growing circulation, encourages the promoters to continue it.

Copies of THE PATRIOT can be obtained either through the usual agents or direct from the publishers:

THE BOSWELL PRINTING & PUBLISHING CO., LTD.,
2, WHITEFRIARS STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.

Single Copies, 6d.; or 7d. post free.

Terms of Subscription:—
3 months, 7s. 6d.; 6 months, 15/-; One year, 30/-.

Back numbers can still be supplied either direct or through the trade at the originol price.

DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND'S FUND.

The following Publications can be obtained free on application from the

PUBLICITY DEPARTMENT,
THE BOSWELL PRINTING & PUBLISHING CO., Ltd.,
2, Whitefriars Street, London, E.C.4.

LIST OF PAMPHLETS.

The Conspiracy Against the British Empire.
The Truth About the Coal Strike.
The Revolutionary Aspect of the Miners' Strike.
Some Leading Facts of the Conspiracy Against the British Empire.
The Plot Against Trade Unions.
The Plot Against Britain (By John Briton).
The Attack on the Empire.
The Government's Irish Policy.
(Speech by the Duke of Northumberland at Newcastle on 29th October, 1921.)
The League of Nations (By John Briton), with introduction by the Duke of Northumberland.

LIST OF LEAFLETS.

The Coal Strike. What is Behind it?
Ireland.—Finding of the Royal Commission.
Federalism Perverted (By Richard Jebb).

BOOKS TO BE READ.

	PRICE.
The Limits of Pure Democracy — Author—W. H. Mallock. Publishers—Chapman & Hall.	15/-
Democracy at the Crossways — Author—F. J. C. Hearnshaw. Publishers—Macmillan & Co.	15/-
The Red Light — Author—Ernest E. Williams. Publishers—Freedom Association.	2/6
Red Terror and Green — Author—R. Dawson. Publishers—John Murray.	6/-
Disloyalty — Author—Harold Owen. Publishers—Hurst & Blackett.	6/-
Unpopular Opinions — Author—Harold Owen. Publishers—Erskine Macdonald, Ltd.	6/-
The French Revolution — Author—Nesta H. Webster. Publishers—Constable & Co., Ltd.	21/-
The World Revolution — Author—Nesta H. Webster. Publishers—Constable & Co., Ltd.	18/-
The World at the Cross Roads — Author—Boris Brasol. Copies from The Britons, 62, Oxford Street, W.	12/6
The Coal Crisis — Author—W. Livesey. Publishers—Simpkin Marshall.	1/-
Labour Trusts — Author—T. Rich. Publishers—Boswell Printing & Publishing Co., Ltd.	6d.
La Mystification des Peuples Alliés — Author—A. Chéradame. Publishers—Ch. Hérissey, Evreux, Eure, France. Sold direct by printers at	frs. 10

(Copies can be obtained from The Boswell Co., at 5s. post free.)

Published by THE BOSWELL PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO., LTD., 2, Whitefriars Street, London, E.C.4.
Printed by ST. CLEMENTS PRESS, LTD., Portugal Street, Kingsway, W.C.2.